

## REMARKS

This Reply is submitted in response to the Office Action dated February 25, 2010. Claims 1-5, 8-12, 16-20, and 22-24 remain present in this application. Claims 6, 7, 13-15, and 21 have been cancelled. In the present Office Action: paragraph [058] of the specification was objected to; claims 1-23 were objected to; the drawings were objected to; claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,603,857 (hereinafter “Batten-Carew”); claims 1-7, 9-15, 19, 21, 23, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Batten-Carew in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0052071 (hereinafter “Kudo”); claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Batten-Carew in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,813,358 (hereinafter “Di Crescenzo”); and claims 8, and 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Batten-Carew and Kudo in further view of Di Crescenzo. Applicant has amended: paragraph [058] to address the objection to paragraph [058]; claims 1-23 to address the objections to claims 1-23; and paragraphs [066] and [067] to address the drawing objections. Applicant submits that the specification, claim, and drawing objections are all now moot. Applicant has also amended claims 1, 9, 20, 23, and 24 for clarification of Applicant’s claimed subject matter. No new matter has been entered with the amendments to the claims and/or specification.

With respect to the rejection of independent claims 1, 9, 20, 23, and 24, as amended, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Batten-Carew and Kudo does not teach (or suggest) all of the claim features. Applicant agrees that Batten-Carew discloses techniques for controlling the release of sensitive information that is encrypted with an encryption key and the generation of a decryption key (from a secret number that is released after a future time) for decrypting the encrypted sensitive information. Applicant also agrees that Batten-Carew discloses that the secret number may correspond to a private key (e.g., a decryption key) with a corresponding public key (e.g., an encryption key) being dependent thereon. Applicant further agrees that Batten-Carew does not teach or suggest a trusted body that provides a digital certificate signed with a private key of the trusted body to the publisher prior to a specified date and time, wherein the digital certificate provides the publisher with the encryption key prior to the specified date and time. However, Applicant does not agree that one of ordinary skill in the

art would be motivated to modify Batten-Carew per Kudo in view of the rationale set forth in the Office Action.

Applicant notes that Kudo paragraph [0003] discloses a communication between a user A and a user B in which a public encryption key of the user A, a name of the user A, and a digital signature of a certification authority (CA) are included in a certificate for the user A that is provided to the user B. As is disclosed, the user B obtains the certificate for the user A and confirms that the CA has provided the public encryption key for the user A. Assuming the digital signature is correct, the user B encrypts a target message for the user A with the public encryption key for the user A and sends the encrypted target message to the user A. However, it is unclear to Applicant how providing the encryption key according to Kudo limits the time for decrypting information, as contrasted with encrypting information. More specifically, Batten-Carew discloses preventing disclosure of encrypted information by not releasing a decryption key until after a future time. In sum, Kudo discloses that providing the public encryption key of the user A (to the user B) in the form of a certificate ensures that the public encryption key actually belongs to the user A (see Kudo paragraph [0004]), but does not allow the user B to limit when the user A may decrypt the encrypted message.

Moreover, Applicant does not agree that Kudo paragraph [0003], lines 4-10, discloses multiple publishers that each have a password issued by a trusted body for preventing disclosure of a decryption key. More specifically, the cited Kudo passage is directed to providing an encryption key to a user, as contrasted with a decryption key, passworded or otherwise. Furthermore, the “name” is the name of the user that is to receive encrypted information and does not correspond to a password.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that Applicant’s independent claims 1, 9, 20, 23, and 24, as amended, are allowable over the applied art of record (alone or in combination). Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 2-5, 8, 10-12, 16-19, and 22 are also allowable for at least the reason that the claims depend on allowable claims.

In the event that the Examiner believes that an additional telephone conference would further prosecution of the present application, Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney at (512) 617-5521.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael R. Long", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Michael R. Long

Reg. No. 42,808

DILLON & YUDELL LLP

8911 North Capital of Texas Highway, Ste. 2110

Austin, Texas 78759

Telephone (512) 617-5521

Facsimile (512) 343-6446

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)